UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,438	11/01/2001	Faisal M. Awada	AU920010885US1	3560

7590 03/21/2005

Mr. Volel Emile
P.O. Box 202170
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER	
RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,438	AWADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,6,7,12,13,18,19 and 24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,6,7,12,13,18,19 and 24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 24 November 2004.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

The rejection of claims 5, 11, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment

Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13, 18-19, and 24 are pending. Claims 2-5, 8-11, 14-17 and 20-23 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13, 18-19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisebois (U.S. Patent 6,219,679 B1) in view of Littlefield (U.S. Patent 6,564,208 B1).

As per claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Brisbois discloses a method, apparatus, computer program product and computer system containing a processor and memory for bookmarking a section of a Web page including storing a network address (or URL) of the page (See Brisbois, Figure 3A, and Column 4, lines 62-63), storing the section of the page such that when the network address is used to access and display the page, the section of the page is displayed (See Brisbois, Column 1, lines 54-67), the section storing step including storing a current size of a window within which the page is displayed (See Brisbois, Figure 3C, and Column 5, lines 33-36), and storing positions of scroll boxes in scroll bars in the window (See Brisbois, Figure 3D, and Column 5, lines 49-53). Brisebois does not disclose expressly storing font attributes of the displayed page. Littlefield discloses storing font attribute information within a search result web page. (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 49-59). Brisebois and Littlefield are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of storing Web page information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the storing of font attribute information of Littlefield with the storing of the section of the Web page of Brisebois. The motivation for doing so would have been to display the text items of the Web page that contain non-default font attributes using the non-default font attributes specified in the Web page. (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 54-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Littlefield with Brisebois for the benefit of displaying text using the font attributes specified in the Web page to obtain the invention as defined in claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

As per claims 6, 12, 18, and 24, Brisebois and Littlefield disclose the limitations of claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 as described above. Brisebois also discloses storing X-Y coordinates of the window and the scroll boxes. (See Brisebois, Figure 3A, Column 4, lines 62-67, Column 5, lines 1-2, and Column 6, lines 45-53).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 24 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant indicates that the phrase "**storing** the font attribute at locations within a search result web page..." as cited from the Littlefield reference is equivalent to "**entering** or **placing** the font attribute information at locations within a search result web page..." rather than "**storing** the font attributes" (emphasis added), as claimed in the instant application. The Office respectfully disagrees. The Littlefield reference cites **storing** font attributes by "embedding tags to such items in the Web page" (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 49-59). As the embedded tags are contained within the code for the Web page, it is clear that the font attributes are **stored** within the code for the Web page.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER